UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS SAN ANTONIO DIVISION

KRISJENN RANCH, LLC, ET AL,)	CASE NO: 20-05027-rbk
)	ADVERSARY
Plaintiffs,)	
)	San Antonio, Texas
vs.)	
)	Thursday, November 2, 2023
DMA PROPERTIES, INC, ET AL,)	
)	10:00 a.m. to 10:31 a.m.
Defendants.)	
LEAD CASE: 20-50805-rbk		
KrisJenn Ranch, LLC		

STATUS HEARING

BEFORE THE HONORABLE RONALD B. KING, UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

APPEARANCES: SEE PAGE 2

Courtroom Deputy: Deanna Castleberry

Court Recorder [ECRO]: Maxine McGee

Transcribed by: Exceptional Reporting Services, Inc.

P.O. Box 8365

Corpus Christi, TX 78468

361 949-2988

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording; transcript produced by transcription service.

APPEARANCES: For Plaintiffs: CHARLES JOHN MULLER, IV, ESQ. C.J. Muller & Associates 111 W. Sunset Rd. San Antonio, TX 78209 210-664-5000 For Defendants: AUSTIN H. KRIST, ESQ. Cleveland Krist 303 Camp Craft Road Suite 325 Austin, TX 78746 737-900-7107

```
heard that the Texas Railroad Commission issue is moot. We've addressed that issue with the opposing side and told them if they want to register, we will not interfere. And but it appears that we're not going down that road anymore.
```

We have another -- and so if that's abated, the briefing deadlines for next week are really just relating to this -- Mr. Wright, when he wound up Krisjenn, has moved the property, the title into a new company, the H2O Express company.

He intends in every way still to return to the Court and disclose any potential sale and allow Mr. Moore and Mr. Borders to share in the 40 percent proceeds that they're entitled to receive under the bankruptcy plan.

And so if the issue is just that the title, that the moving of the title is, you know, improper, I think we can nip that in the bud because my client will gladly just move it straight back.

I don't think that's in anybody's financial best interest because there's a small group of people in Texas who would be potential buyers for this property.

And the Krisjenn name has been fairly tainted at this point which (inaudible) idea of getting it out into a new, clean entity.

But if opposing believes that that was improper in any way, our clients are willing to cure and fix it

```
1
    immediately.
 2
              If they're fine with title staying where it is, we
    (inaudible) promise (inaudible) and honor the spirit of the
 3
    plan. So hopefully that could resolve that issue right here
 4
 5
    and now.
              I hear --
 6
              THE COURT: Couldn't you keep it in the original
    entity and just change the name of the entity also?
 7
              MR. MULLER: He could. He could keep -- he could --
    he actually did that initially. He had a DBA. The original
10
    name was like Express, so he wanted to keep the H2O Express
11
    Pipeline, and he did that. But he's had trouble selling it and
12
    so he put it into a new entity per se.
13
              There's a little more backdrop to this but long story
14
    short is if counsel would prefer the title be returned to
15
    Krisjenn and use a DBA, we're happy to do that.
16
              MR. KRIST: Your Honor, in terms of evidence, you
17
    know, there's just the evidence that I mentioned a moment ago.
18
              I'm happy to talk with Mr. Muller after this hearing
19
    to figure out if there's some way to resolve this issue of
20
    title being transferred between the two entities.
              If we can resolve it, then we won't need to argue it.
21
22
    If we can't resolve it, then that's the evidence that we would
23
    be presenting.
24
              THE COURT:
                         Okay. So --
25
              MR. MULLER:
                           Your Honor, I --
```

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. MULLER: We've already discussed this. I -- my negotiations have been primarily with Mr. Johns and Tim, so I don't think Mr. Krist has been there. But to be clear, we've made this offer on many occasions, and we're happy to do it.

I will say if we want to proceed to litigate it, I think the position of Mr. Moore and Mr. Borders is that the transfer of title is a violation of the Court's orders I think is what was said.

And, again, I'm not a bankruptcy attorney. I rely on Ron to be my seeing eye dog here. But it's my understanding it's really the bankruptcy plan is a contract and that we would have to have an adversary on breach of contract for which there would be no damages because we're agreeable to honoring the plan.

And it seems like an awful lot of work for a problem that can be resolved very quickly and easily.

The other issue we have, Your Honor, is that the bankruptcy plan says that that my client, Mr. Wright, has the ability to sell the property in this interim period free and clear while the appeal is pending.

The problem is, is that after Judge Pulliam ruled,
Mr. Moore has picked up the phone and called every prospective
purchaser that we know of and told them that the nature of
Mr. Pulliam's ruling is that Mr. Wright has lost the ownership

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

contained within the remand from the district court, and I

- don't think it should be picked up. But Your Honor can address
 that when you see the briefing.
- 3 **THE COURT:** Okay. So the original deadline was
- 4 October 25th and December the 11th, and then it was extended
- 5 | two weeks to November 8th, and then I guess Christmas for
- 6 Wright and Krisjenn. So you can file it on Christmas,
- 7 Mr. Muller. You're not going to be doing anything, right?
- 8 MR. MULLER: Yeah. I'm looking forward to that.
- 9 Well, Your Honor, as you said in the last status
- 10 | conference, I think you had brought this up, this issue of
- 11 Mr. Wright has -- you know, I think they've couched this -- I
- 12 | don't know how they're presenting this, as a motion for
- 13 | sanctions I believe.
- But I think your Court had pointed out that if their
- 15 | issue is (inaudible) violation of the plan, that it needs to be
- 16 | brought up as a new adversary, and it needs to have, you know,
- 17 | its own new discovery.
- And obviously nobody wants that. I know Your Honor
- 19 doesn't. I know you're trying to get this case closed.
- 20 But we told you at that time we were going to try to
- 21 | work it out and avoid this, but that if we had to litigate this
- 22 issue, we do not want to do it in this hybrid, you know,
- 23 | sanctions-type order, that we really wanted it to be filed as a
- 24 new adversary.
- 25 And that would be (inaudible) compelled to reply to

- 11 1 this briefing, that will remain our position, that procedurally 2 that these gentlemen need to file their own new adversary, asserting a violation of the bankruptcy plan. 3 And as Mr. Krist point out, that this is not about 4 5 the appeal. He's right, we're not adding new issues on appeal. 6 This will be a new adversary and new issues relating to 7 violations of the bankruptcy plan. THE COURT: Well, correct me if I'm wrong but this 8
 - adversary proceeding was to determine the nature of the ownership and then also perhaps whether there was a breach of fiduciary duty and damages for that. Wasn't that the main thrust of this adversary originally?
 - MR. MULLER: No, Your Honor. There was no question of ownership. The question of ownership's always been stipulated.

16 The issue was whether the -- Mr. Moore --

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

19

20

21

- 17 **THE COURT:** The nature of it, whether it's a personal covenant or one running with the land.
 - MR. MULLER: Right. It's a net profits interest so it's a not silent, non-ownership interest that entitles

 Mr. Border and Mr. Moore to share in profits, if there are any.
- But the question was whether that could run with the land like an oil and gas royalty (inaudible) --
- 24 **THE COURT:** And so Judge Pulliam decided that it did 25 run with the land. And so what's left to decide? He remanded

However, Judge Pulliam in his wisdom has said, well, in addition to damages, the Court can also consider equitable remedies, in particular the equitable remedy of disgorgement, and that that remedy can be issued by the Court notwithstanding damages. You don't have to have damages to have disgorgement.

And so the issue that's before you on remand is whether Mr. Wright -- some interest of Mr. Wright or Krisjenn Ranch would be disgorged as a result of a breach of an informal fiduciary duty.

I do not believe we're returning to you on damages.

And I do believe that that issue is very well-briefed in the law, and so I think it will -- I think it'll be a little bit like an extended motion for summary judgment (inaudible).

THE COURT: Well, if you look at Judge Pulliam's opinion on page 37, it says as to appellate issue two, this court reverses and remands for further consideration because this court's role is not to determine the proper measure of damages.

Because the court has found a valid covenant running with the land, the Bankruptcy Court should consider the damage model presented to it in the first instance. Such further consideration shall also include the other gains-based remedies pursued at trial, etc.

So, I mean, it sounds like it was remanded to determine the proper measure of damages.

- 1 MR. KRIST: That's correct, Your Honor.
- 2 MR. MULLER: (Inaudible) yeah, if it is remanded to
- 3 you on damages, I think we'll have to look in the record. But,
- 4 again, I don't think there was any evidence of damages. And I
- 5 don't think there can be.
- 6 THE COURT: Well, I've got to go back and re-read the
- 7 record obviously, which was transcribed for the appeal, but --
- 8 because I held that the damages weren't proven because there
- 9 | wasn't a covenant running with the land. And so --
- 10 MR. MULLER: (Inaudible)
- 11 **THE COURT:** -- he found the other way on that issue.
- 12 MR. MULLER: I believe when you read the record
- 13 | you'll see that you ruled that way because there was this claim
- 14 about this proper loan.
- But the reality was Mr. Moore paid -- or Mr. Wright
- 16 | paid off principal. He didn't charge any interest to Mr. Moore
- 17 or Mr. Borders. There was just no -- that issue was because
- 18 | there just -- literally they never paid anything. Those
- 19 gentlemen, all they --
- THE COURT: We'll argue all that -- yeah, we'll argue
- 21 | all that at the appropriate time. I'm not trying to stir it up
- 22 for today's purposes. I'm just trying to sort of get what the
- 23 issues are.
- So Mr. Muller's brief is due on Christmas Day, which
- 25 I assume he might file it before that.

```
18
 1
              THE COURT:
                         Okav.
 2
              MR. KRIST:
                         -- Your Honor. I believe --
 3
              THE COURT: That's good.
              MR. KRIST: -- that the only evidence we'd be
 4
 5
    presenting would be related to that (inaudible) the right-of-
    way, and I think that'd be documentary in nature.
 6
 7
              THE COURT: Okay. Here's another question. Do you
    want to do it Webex, the way we're doing it today, or do you
 8
 9
    want to do it live in the courtroom?
              MR. KRIST: Your Honor, because I believe that this
10
11
    is mostly going to be on the briefing, and because we won't
12
    have -- I don't expect there to be live witnesses, I think that
13
    Webex would be fine from our perspective.
14
              THE COURT: Mr. Muller.
              MR. MULLER: I -- well, I'm confused at this point.
15
    I'm confused.
16
17
              So we -- the original motion that's now been extended
18
    twice had to do with our failure to register the pipeline with
19
    the Texas Railroad Commission. I think (inaudible) --
20
              THE COURT: Well, that's not our issue on remand, is
21
    it?
22
              MR. MULLER: No.
23
              THE COURT:
                          Okay.
24
              MR. MULLER: (Inaudible)
25
              MR. KRIST:
                          Your Honor, we're talking about the
```

```
1 briefing schedule for the remedies on remand.
```

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

thinks.

- 2 **THE COURT:** Right. We're just talking about the remand, the adversary that's -- that was filed in '20.
- I mean, if there's disputes relating to the plan and so forth, maybe those things should be filed in the bankruptcy case. I mean, talk to Mr. Smeberg about it, see what he
- But, I mean, there's motions to enforce plan

 provisions, motion to convert to Chapter 7, motions to dismiss.

 There's all kinds of things that can happen in the case that

 don't require a new adversary proceeding.
 - Now, I'm not expressing an opinion that you don't need an adversary proceeding, so don't get me wrong. I'm just saying that it's not a hundred percent sure that it does require an adversary proceeding. Everybody can kind of figure it out for themselves.
 - MR. MULLER: Yes, Your Honor. But to be clear, I thought I heard Mr. Krist just say the briefing he's preparing for two weeks from now relates to Mr. Wright wrongfully transferring title to the property and has nothing to do with what's on remand.
- 22 THE COURT: I don't think that's in the remand, is 23 it, Mr. Krist?
- MR. KRIST: No, Your Honor. I -- we are going to be briefing up the remedies on remand.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. KRIST: (Inaudible) just trying to indicate that the only additional evidence that we might submit to the Court would be evidence that the right-of-way has been transferred from Krisjenn to another entity because (inaudible) --

THE COURT: (Inaudible) how does that affect the issues on remand?

MR. KRIST: Your Honor, I -- we would contend that transferring the right-of-way, the one main asset here, out of the entity that the judgment was entered against to some other entity, in violation of this Court's order, is something that was done to evade the judgment, and that your Court has equitable discretion to order Mr. Wright to transfer it back or to impose a constructive trust upon any proceeds or whatever that Krisjenn might receive in connection with that transfer.

It might ultimately be a moot point, as Mr. Muller indicated, if they voluntarily transfer the right-of-way back to Krisjenn.

THE COURT: Okay. And what order are they violating; if they did that by transferring it, what -- which order is violated? Can you tell me?

MR. KRIST: Yes, Your Honor. I believe the bankruptcy plan included provisions that required that we be provided with 30 days' notice in advance of any attempt to transfer the right-of-way. We didn't --

```
THE COURT: Okav.
```

MR. KRIST: -- receive that notice. And on top of that, if I can briefly finish, we would continue that it would be improper and that Your Honor would have equitable discretion to impose a constructive trust on Krisjenn and Mr. Wright for this transfer, even independent of the bankruptcy plan.

THE COURT: Okay. So what you're saying is they violated the terms of the plan which was confirmed, and so the confirmation order is a final judgment in effect.

And the plan is more or less a contract between the parties, and so they violated that contract and that judgment confirming the plan. I mean, is that kind of the idea?

MR. KRIST: That is one idea.

And then the second idea would be that, Your Honor, we're asking for equitable remedies here and that this would be relevant (inaudible) --

THE COURT: (Inaudible) set aside the transfer.

MR. KRIST: Whether you set aside the transfer or impose a instructive trust on any proceeds that Mr. Wright may personally receive because he's still in this case and we're still seeking remedies against him.

THE COURT: Yeah. Once again, I'm not trying to stir up any litigation or disagreements. But, I mean, I'll listen to what you have to say, and if you have evidence, I'll listen to it.

- But it sounds kind of like that's a separate matter from the issues on remand. The issues on remand are establishing a measure of damages and perhaps granting damages, according to Judge Pulliam's order.

 And of course I have to follow his judgment, his order reversing and remanding. Ultimately the Fifth Circuit may affirm that and they may not agree with it, if it goes that far.

 But the issue on the transfer of the entity is important, I realize. But to me that's a separate issue than the issues on remand.
- So if they violated the terms of the plan which was confirmed by final order, and I don't think anybody appealed the confirmation order, that's a separate matter.
 - And that might be something you can take care of by a motion, by a contested matter, rather than a new adversary proceeding.
 - New adversary proceedings can be expedited but they generally drag a lot longer than a contested matter, as evidenced by this one which was filed over three years ago.
 - You know, contested matters we usually get out of the way in 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, something like that.

 Adversaries can drag on and on like a trial in U.S. District

 Court.
- MR. KRIST: Your Honor, we'll address those issues in

1 MR. MULLER: I was just going to go over my schedule. 2 I've got a one-day trial, one or two-day trial on January the 16th. But I have a very complex trial on -- in -- on February 3 4 the 20th. And then I have a -- my next is (inaudible) the 5 Anyway, that's my current trial schedule. 6 THE COURT: So 16th, so obviously anything before 7 that you don't want a hearing. Maybe late January, like 23rd, 8 30th, something like that. 9 MR. MULLER: Yes. 10 THE COURT: You said February 20th was your next big 11 trial. 12 MR. MULLER: Yes. I'd like to be -- you know, yeah, 13 the last week of January perhaps, Your Honor. 14 THE COURT: That's fine. Mr. Krist? 15 MR. KRIST: Your Honor, I believe that that should 16 work for us. I am out of town that Thursday, Friday. I 17 believe I am available the 29th, 30th, and 31st. 18 I would also --19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. KRIST: I'm going to confer with Mr. Chris Johns 21 who's been the lead counsel on the appellate briefing --22 THE COURT: Right. 23 MR. KRIST: -- to make sure that he's --24 THE COURT: Right. 25 MR. KRIST: -- available as well. But my schedule is

```
1 | clear on all three of those days.
```

- 2 THE COURT: So -- and check with your clients, too.
- 3 | I mean, if they want to tune in so to speak, they can do that.
- 4 Or if they don't want to, they don't have to. They're not
- 5 required to be there of course.
- 6 Let's look at January 30th, which is a Tuesday, at
- 7 | 10:00 o'clock tentatively. So why don't you all check on that
- 8 and let Ms. Castleberry know. And we will probably do it that
- 9 day unless there's some good reason not to.
- 10 MR. KRIST: Yes, Your Honor. Can I also ask one
- 11 quick logistical question related to the briefing?
- 12 **THE COURT:** Sure.
- 13 MR. KRIST: When we cite to the record, would you
- 14 prefer that we cite to the appellate pagination from that
- 15 | record or would you prefer that we cite it based on the day the
- 16 testimony occurred and what volume it is in the underlying
- 17 record?
- 18 **THE COURT:** Just the date that it occurred and the
- 19 ECF number like -- I assume you did a transcript of all the
- 20 evidence, right?
- 21 MR. KRIST: Yes, Your Honor, that's correct.
- 22 **THE COURT:** That was in the spring of '21. Let me
- 23 look at that. Okay. ECF 258 is a transcript of a hearing on
- 24 February the 11th. Was that the trial, February of '21?
- 25 **MR. KRIST:** I --

```
27
 1
              MR. MULLER: (Inaudible) was bifurcated when we
 2
    (inaudible) --
 3
              THE COURT: Okay. Let me look at the transcript.
    It's 113 pages. Didn't we do several days of trial?
 4
                         Yes, we did, Your Honor.
 5
              MR. KRIST:
 6
              THE COURT:
                         Okay.
 7
              MR. MULLER: It was two weeks, over two weeks.
                                                               We
 8
    went for about a week and then we had a big COVID break, and
 9
    then we came back (inaudible) --
10
              THE COURT: Oh, yeah, we had a break for COVID,
11
    that's right. Started in January, didn't it?
              MR. KRIST: Yes, it did, Your Honor.
12
13
              THE COURT: And then --
14
              MR. MULLER: Yes, Your Honor.
15
              THE COURT: And then everybody on Mr. Muller's side
16
    got COVID.
17
              MR. MULLER: Yes, Your Honor.
18
              THE COURT: Okay. Yeah, January 21 it looks like.
19
    Okay. And so then it got reset to maybe March or something
20
    like that. February 11th, sorry, February 11th.
21
              So just use the Bankruptcy Court ECF numbers that --
22
    you know, if you're using the district court numbers, we're
23
    going to have to be cross-referencing things and it's going to
24
    be confusing. So the ECF numbers in the bankruptcy.
25
              And then, you know, like ECF number -- what is this?
```

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Join Hudson

February 26, 2025

Signed

Dated

TONI HUDSON, TRANSCRIBER